UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,264	10/23/2003	Jon Cargille	MS1-1815US	1567

22801 7590 04/10/2007
LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER	
ANYA, CHARLES E	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2194	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/10/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 04/10/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhptoms@leehayes.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/692,264	CARGILLE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Charles E. Anya	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3/ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10/23/03*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-74* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-74* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *9/22/05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-74 are pending is this application.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1-40 and 48 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1 appears to include typographical error. Specifically, line 7 is omitting "on".

For the purpose of this office action the Examiner would insert "on" before "operation".

Claim 48 appears to include typographical error. Specifically, limitation of claim 48 seems to be incomplete.

For the purpose of this office action the Examiner would change the limitation to "a method according to Claim 41, further comprising receiving a call **for a transaction object** to be committed to the transaction".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. **Claims 1-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.**

The current focus of the Patent Office in regard to statutory inventions under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for method claims and claims that recite a judicial exception (software) is that the claimed invention recite a practical application. Practical application can be provided by a physical transformation or a useful, concrete and tangible result. No physical transformation is recited and additionally, for instance, the final result of claim 41 is "receiving a call confirming receipt of the call indicating the outcome of the transaction" which is not a tangible result because neither a practical application is claimed or the final result available for use. This rejection is applicable to claims 1,40,41,52,63,70 and 74.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 41-51 and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The following terms do not clearly point out the subject matter:

i. "API" on line 5 of claims 41and 74. "API" is an abbreviation and does not clearly describe it's meaning.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-3,5-12,14,15,18,21-25,27-40 and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,157,927 to Schaefer et al.

6. As to claim 1, Schaefer teaches interfaces, embodied on one or more computer-readable media, to be called on kernel transaction management objects, comprising: application program interfaces (APIs) to implement operations on a kernel transaction object (TX) (figure 4D "...ITransaction interface..." Col. 15 Ln. 15 – 33) and APIs to implement operations on a kernel resource management object (RMO) (figure 4E "...IResourceManager interface..." Col. 15 Ln. 51 – 62) and APIs to implement operations on a kernel enlistment (en) object (figure 4C "...ITransactionEnlistAsync interface and an IPrepareInfo interface..." Col. 16 Ln. 54 – 67).

7. As to claim 2, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 1, wherein each of the APIs to implement operations on TX, RMO, and EN utilize a handle to refer to an object ("...pointer..." Col. 15 Ln. 20 – 33, Col. 22 Ln. 45 – 51).

8. As to claim 3, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein each of the handles is an opaque reference to a unique object ("...pointer..." Col. 15 Ln. 20 – 33).

9. As to claim 5, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API calls for TX to transmit a prepare request to resource managers enlisted in a transaction ("...PrepareRequest..." Col. 16 Ln. 64 – 67).

10. As to claim 6, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API calls for a new TX to be created for a transaction ("...creates..." Col. 15 Ln. 15 – 20).

11. As to claim 7, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API calls for an existing TX to be opened for a transaction ("...tpconnect..." Col. 12 Ln. 63 – 67, Col. 13 Ln. 11 – 19, Col. 14 Ln. 59 – 67, Col. 25 Ln. 40 – 59).

12. As to claim 8, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API calls for TX to commit a transaction ("...CommitRequest..." Col. 16 Ln. 18 – 42).

13. As to claim 9, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API calls for TX to abort a transaction ("...AbortRequest..." Col. 16 Ln. 18 – 42).

14. As to claim 10, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API calls for TX to save a current state of the transaction ("...commit..." Col. 13 Ln. 1 – 10, Col. 14 Ln. 35 – 40).

15. As to claim 11, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API calls for TX to retrieve information about the TX for a requestor ("...GetTransactionInfo method..." Col. 15 Ln. 28 – 31).

16. As to claim 12, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API calls for TX to set information ("...SetComplete() method..." Col. 25 Ln. 46 – 50).

17. As to claim 14, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API is: PreprepareEnlistment, PrepareEnlistment, OpenEnlistment CreateTransaction, OpenTransaction, CommitTransaction, RollbackTransaction, SavepointTransaction, GetTransactionInfo, and SetTransactionInfo ("...GetTransactionInfo method..." Col. 15 Ln. 28 – 31).

18. As to claim 15, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API calls for a new RMO to be created ("...created..." Col. 15 Ln. 8 – 17).

19. As to claim 18, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API calls for an existing RMO to open for a transaction ("...tpconnect..." Col. 12 Ln. 63 – 67, Col. 13 Ln. 11 – 19, Col. 14 Ln. 59 – 67, Col. 25 Ln. 40 – 59).

20. As to claim 21, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API calls for RMO to set information ("...Enlist method...Reenlist method..." Col. 15 Ln. 51 – 62).

21. As to claim 22, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API calls for RMO to be enlisted on a transaction at least once ("...Enlist method..." Col. 15 Ln. 51 – 62, Col. 16 Ln. 8 – 17).

22. As to claim 23, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API calls for a notification from a resource manager for RMO ("...ReenlistmentComplete method..." Col. 15 Ln. 51 – 62).

23. As to claim 24, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API is: CreateResourceManager, OpenResourceManager,

DestroyResourceManager, GetResourceManagerInfo, SetResourceManagerInfo, CreateEnlistment, and GetNotificationResourceManager ("...created..." Col. 16 Ln. 8 – 10).

24. As to claim 25, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API is to implement operations on TX by RMO ("...IResourceManager interface..." Col. 15 Ln. 51 – 62).

25. As to claim 27, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 25, wherein the at least one API is to inform TX that transaction preparation has been completed by a requested resource manager ("...PrepareRequestDone..." Col. 16 Ln. 16 Ln. 60 – 67).

26. As to claim 28, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 25, wherein the at least one API is to inform TX that a resource manager has completed rolling back a transaction ("...AbortRequestDone..." Col. 17 Ln. 1 – 6, Col. 18 Ln. 21 – 25).

27. As to claim 29, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 25, wherein the at least one API is to inform TX that a resource manager has committed to a transaction ("...CommitRequestDone method..." Col. 17 Ln. 1 – 3).

28. As claim 30, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 25, wherein the at least one API is: PrePrepareComplete, PrepareComplete, RollbackComplete, and CommitComplete ("...PrepareRequest..." Col. 16 Ln. 60 – 67, "...CommitRequestDone method..." Col. 17 Ln. 1 – 3).

29. As to claim 31, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein least one API calls for a resource manager to be registered as a communications resource manager for a particular protocol (Resource Manager 70 Col. 13 Ln. 21 – 28, Col. 15 Ln. 4 – 8).

30. As to claim 32, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API calls for a representation of a transaction to be serialized into a buffer ("...encoding and decoding..." Col. 14 Ln. 50 – 54).

31. As to claim 33, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API calls for information representing registered protocols to be serialized into a buffer ("...encoding and decoding..." Col. 14 Ln. 50 – 54).

32. As to claim 34, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 32, wherein at least one API calls for a transaction represented by the serialization be made available by a transaction management object ("...encoding and decoding..." Col. 14 Ln. 50 – 54).

33. As to claim 35, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API calls for a transaction to be propagated to a destination using push-style propagation ("...propagate information..." Col. 15 Ln. 63 – 67).

34. As to claim 36, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 35, wherein at least one API calls for the output of the API calls for the transaction to be propagated to a destination using push-style propagation to be retrieved ("...propagate..." Col. 27 Ln. 64 – 67).

35. As to claim 37, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 31, wherein at least one API is called when transaction propagation has been completed ("...CommitRequestDone method..." Col. 17 Ln. 1 – 3, "...Commit Complete Indication..." Col. 18 Ln. 16 – 20, "...hptpx_commit_complete..." Col. 31 Ln. 20 – 35).

36. As to claim 38, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 31, wherein at least one API is called when requested transaction propagation has failed ("...AbortRequest method..." Col. 18 Ln. 7 – 25).

37. As to claim 39, Schaefer teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API is: RegisterProtocolAddressInformation, MarshallTransaction, GetProtocolAddressInformation, PullTransaction, PushTransaction, PushTransactionBuffer, PropagationComplete, and PropagationFailed

("...CommitRequestDone method..." Col. 17 Ln. 1 – 3, "...Commit Complete Indication..." Col. 18 Ln. 16 – 20, "...hptpx_commit_complete..." Col. 31 Ln. 20 – 35).

38. As to claim 40, Schaefer teaches an apparatus for implementing a transaction, comprising: a kernel transaction object (TX) (Transaction Object 78 Col. 15 Ln. 15 – 33); a kernel resource manager object (RMO) (Resource Manager Object Col. 15 Ln. 51 – 62, Col. 16 Ln. 8 – 17); and a kernel enlistment object (EN) (Enlistment Object 80 Col. 16 LN. 54 – 67), wherein two-phase commit processing is executed by calling APIs on the TX, the RMO, and the EN ("...ITransactionEnlistmentAsync interface..." Col. 16 Ln. 54 – 67).

39. As to claim 74, Schaefer teaches an apparatus for implementing a transaction, comprising: means for representing a transaction (Transaction Object 78 Col. 15 Ln. 15 – 33); and means for representing a relationship between the means for representing the transaction and a resource participating in the transaction (Resource Manager Object Col. 15 Ln. 51 – 62, Col. 16 Ln. 8 – 17), wherein two-phase commit processing is executed by calling APIs between the means for representing a transaction and the means for representing a relationship ("...ITransactionEnlistmentAsync interface..." Col. 16 Ln. 54 – 67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

40. Claims 4,16,17,20 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,157,927 to Schaefer et al., in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,728,958 B1 to Klein et al.

41. As to claim 4, Schaefer is silent with reference to interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API calls for TX to transmit pre-prepare messages to resource managers associated with a transaction.

Klein teaches to interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API calls for TX to transmit pre-prepare messages to resource managers associated with a transaction ("...pre-prepare notification..." Col. 2 Ln. 19 – 23, Ln. 40 – 44, Ln. 57 – 67, Col. 7 Ln. 37 – 39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Schaefer with the teaching of Klein because the teaching of Klein would improve the system of Schaefer by providing resource managers with extra "pre-prepare" processing prior to the commencement of commitment processing and supporting porting a foreign database system on the local platform by writing to a file system (Klein Col. 7 Ln. 24 – 30).

42. As to claim 16, Klein teaches interfaces according to claim 15, wherein the new RMO is volatile ("...volatile resource manager (VRM) Col. 6 Ln. 63 – 67, Col. 7 Ln. 1 - 2).

43. As to claim 17, Klein teaches interfaces according to claim 15, wherein the new RMO is durable ("...recoverable resource manager..." Col. 6 Ln. 63 – 67).

44. As to claim 20, Klein teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API calls for RMO to transmit information regarding RMO to a requestor (Col. 7 Ln. 1 – 23).

45. As to claim 26, Klein teaches interfaces according to claim 25, wherein the at least one API is to inform TX that pre-preparing is complete ("...ready signal..." Col. 8 Ln. 33 – 41).

46. Claims 13 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,157,927 to Schaefer et al., in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,101,527 to Lejeune et al.

47. As to claim 13, Schaefer is silent with reference to interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API calls for TX to close.

Lejeune teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API calls for TX to close ("...xa_close..." Col. 5 Ln. 40 – 42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Schaefer with the teaching of Lejeune because the teaching of Lejeune would improve the system of Schaefer by providing a process for allowing disconnection from a resource manager (Lejeune Col. 5 Ln. 41 – 42).

48. As to claim 19, Lejeune teaches interfaces according to claim 2, wherein at least one API calls for RMO to be destroyed ("...terminate..." Col. 16 Ln. 48 – 57).

49. Claims 41-48, and 50-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,922,685 B2 to Greene et al., in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,157,927 to Schaefer et al.

50. As to claim 41, Greene teaches a transaction method for a kernel transaction object, comprising: receiving a call to open a transaction (Step 1304 Col. 56 Ln. 30 – 45); transmitting a call to prepare for a transaction (Step 1330 "..."prepare" call..." Col. 57 Ln. 25 – 33).

Greene is silent with reference to receiving a call confirming prepare complete; transmitting a call indicating an outcome of the transaction; and

receiving a call confirming receipt of the call indicating the outcome of the transaction.

Schaefer teaches receiving a call confirming prepare complete ("...PrepareRequestDone method..." Col. 16 Ln. 54 – 67); transmitting a call indicating an outcome of the transaction ("...notifies the resource manager 70..." Col. 24 Ln. 15 – 20); and receiving a call confirming receipt of the call indicating the outcome of the transaction ("...invoking the appropriate method..." Col. 24 Ln. 15 – 20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Greene with the teaching of Schaefer because the teaching of Schaefer would improve the system of Greene by ensuring durability of transaction (Schaefer Col. 23 Ln. 62).

51. As to claim 42, Greene teaches a method according to claim 41, wherein the call to open is received from a client application ("...client..." Col. 56 Ln. 30 – 41).

52. As to claim 43, Greene teaches a method according to claim 41, wherein the call to prepare is transmitted to resource managers enlisted on a transaction ("...notifies the resource manager 70..." Col. 24 Ln. 15 – 20).

53. As to claim 44, Schaefer teaches a method according to claim 43, wherein the call to prepare, supplies a handle for the transaction to be prepared for, and

supplies a handle to the kernel transaction object ("...a reference (i.e., pointer)..." Col. 15 Ln. 15 – 33).

54. As to claim 45, Schaefer teaches a method according to claim 41, wherein the call confirming prepare complete is received from a resource manager enlisted on the transaction ("...PrepareRequestDone method..." Col. 16 Ln. 54 – 67).

55. As to claim 46, Schaefer teaches a method according to claim 45, wherein the call confirming prepare complete includes a handle indicating the transaction for which the prepare operation has been completed ("...PrepareRequestDone method..." Col. 16 Ln. 54 – 67).

56. As to claim 47, Schaefer teaches a method according to claim 41, wherein the call indicating the outcome of the transaction is transmitted to a resource manager enlisted on the transaction ("...notifies the resource manager 70..." Col. 24 Ln. 15 – 20).

57. As to claim 48, Schaefer teaches a method according to claim 41, further comprising receiving a call for a transaction object to be committed to the transaction ("...CommitRequest..." Col. 17 Ln. 1 – 3).

58. As to claim 50, Schaefer teaches a method according to claim 41, further comprising receiving a call to abort the transaction ("...AbortRequest..." Col. 17 Ln. 1 – 6).

59. As to claim 51, Greene teaches a method according to claim 50, wherein the call to abort the transaction supplies a handle indicating the transaction to be aborted ("...aborts..." Col. 57 Ln. 48 – 49).

60. As to claims 52 and 53, see the rejection of claim 41 above.

61. As to claim 54, see the rejection of claim 44 above.

62. As to claim 55, Schaefer teaches a method according to claim 53, wherein the call confirming prepare complete is transmitted to a transaction object ("...PrepareRequestDone method..." Col. 16 Ln. 54 – 67).

63. As to claim 56, see the rejection of claim 46 above.

64. As to claim 57, Schaefer teaches a method according to claim 52, wherein the call indicating the outcome of the transaction is received from a transaction object ("...invoking the appropriate method..." Col. 24 Ln. 15 – 20).

65. As to claims 58 and 59, see the rejection of claims 50 and 51 above.

66. As to claim 60, Greene teaches a method according to claim 52, further comprising transmitting a call indicating the transaction has been committed (Step 1338 Col. 57 Ln. 34 – 38).

67. As to claim 61, Schaefer teaches a method according to claim 60, wherein the call indicating the transaction has been committed is transmitted to a transaction object, and supplies a handle indicating the transaction for which the commit has been completed ("...CommitRequestDone..." Col. 17 Ln. 1 – 3, Col. 18 Ln. 16 – 19).

68. As to claim 62, Schaefer teaches a method according to claim 52, further comprising setting resource data in accordance with the outcome of the transaction (Col. 18 Ln. 16 – 19).

69. As to claims 63-65, see the rejection of claims 41-43 respectively.

70. As to claim 66-69, see the rejection of claims 45,47,48 and 50 respectively.

71. As to claim 70, see the rejection of claims 41 and 62 above.

72. As to claims 71 and 72, see the rejection of claims 53 and 55 respectively.

73. As to claim 73, see the rejection of claim 57 above.

74. Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,922,685 B2 to Greene et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,157,927 to Schaefer et al., as applied to claim 48 above, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,321,374 to Choy et al.

75. As to claim 49, Schaefer teaches a method according to claim 48, wherein the call to be committed to the transaction supplies a pointer to a location that will receive a handle to the transaction ("...pointer..." Col. 26 Ln. 52 – 65).

Schaefer and Greene are silent with reference to supplies a mask specifying a desired level of access and supplying a pointer to an optional object attribute structure.

Choy teaches supplying a pointer to an optional object attribute structure ("...mask..." Col. 8 Ln. 32 – 44) and supplies a mask specifying a desired level of access (Additional Attribute 146 Col. 7 Ln. 40 – 55).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Schaefer and Greene with the teaching of Choy because the teaching of Choy would improve the system of Schaefer and Greene by allowing for time stamping when transactions are committed (Choy Col. 7 Ln. 50 – 55).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E. Anya whose telephone number is 571-272-3757. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on 571-272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

cea.

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER